PROPERTY RIGHTS IN LAW LICENSES
REFUSALS OF LAW AND JUSTICE TO ANDREW U. D. STRAW

November 27, 2023

"The Indiana Supreme Court fired me from a statewide court officer role without good cause and stole 5 law licenses from me worth $5 million. This caused me such severe poverty over 21 years based on my disabilities that I could not pay the annual dues for a 6th law license, causing me to resign my Virginia law license," Straw said. "Chief Justice of Indiana, **Loretta H. Rush**, caused me to have a severe suspension based on nothing but her misrepresentations about a few cases I lost after her office interfered in federal disability rights cases to ensure I would lose. Virginia State Bar's unanimous 5-judge panel refused to impose this bogus and false Indiana suspension."

"Loretta Rush's husband was choked by one of Rush's clients who was so angry at her that he broke into her home and attacked him," Straw said. "That former client of hers was mentally ill. But I have no criminal history at all. No misdemeanors, no felonies. And I have been suspended in 5 law licenses from Rush's actions for nearly 7 years. That's no different from a disbarment. Rush is biased against people with mental illness like me."

"Meanwhile, this so-called Indiana Chief Justice allowed ***Republican judges*** to actually choke members of the public while bar hopping in downtown Indianapolis," Straw said. "Those criminals **remained judges** and were only given very brief suspensions, nowhere near the abusive and long suspension I have suffered without due process or a single word of mitigating considerations. Attorneys who committed and were convicted of felonies have been suspended and reinstated more quickly than myself, even with my total lack of criminal history."

"I am punished so extremely and unjustly because **I complained**," Straw said. "I worked for the former Chief Justice of Indiana and served every court and judge in the state. It is obvious that my whistleblowing is why Chief Justice Loretta Rush injures me so severely and so long and has no remorse for stealing my law licenses and career. She is the criminal, not

me. The real problem is not even this narcissistic state chief justice, but all the people who encourage and enable her anti-social acts. I blame them as much if not more than I blame her. She can be controlled as an individual, but others who ***should control her*** instead *encourage* Rush's apparent sociopathic behaviors. Maybe they think it's funny. I don't."

"Rush routinely acts with extreme favoritism and no remorse. On her birthday, she wrote and released the tiny suspension order for an actual criminal, the Indiana Attorney General, a Black man who grabbed 4 white women at a public party in Indianapolis," Straw said. "Republicans can do no wrong and it seems my civil rights work and complaints about her court make me into some kind of criminal WITHOUT COMMITTING A CRIME, while real criminals are coddled by Rush."

"For stealing my property worth $5 million, injuring my career, and injuring me personally with official insults, Rush should lose her retention vote in 2024, or better yet, be forced to resign in disgrace," Straw said. "It is an absolute failure of the entire American judicial and legal system that I am punished for my disability rights work as a person disabled from the crimes of others but other American judges parrot her suspension of me ***like gossip***. Rush is rewarded and praised constantly when she should be stripped of office instead, permanently. She is not fit to serve and neither is anyone else who takes her bitter side and injures me more."

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, D.C.

Straw v. United States, 1:21-cv-03079-UNA (D.D.C. 11/29/2021)

D.C. CIRCUIT

Straw v. United States, 21-5300 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 1, 2022)

- *Held*: Proper party was Indiana, not United States, despite Indiana using the outcome of **4 federal cases** (no sanctions in any of them) for its suspension and nothing else.

- *Held*: District Court could not review other federal court actions, even for 5th & 14th Amendment property takings.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Straw v. United States, 21-6713 (2/22/2022)

- *Held*: no grant of certiorari to determine if law license property takings compensation is warranted. *IFP* privileges removed without explanation, only an accusation of abuse of process. This when the U.S. Supreme Court appears to be the **ONLY COURT** that can review this slaughter of law licenses and property rights.
- Apparently, merely using the courts is now considered an ethical violation unless a person wins. And in this pay to play judicial environment with justices gorging at the trough of billionaires, I have no chance of being "favored" by people like that. Thus, this is whence the abuse of frivolous comes.
- This **unethical denial** came on the 21st anniversary of reckless driver breaking my bones from face to ankle as I drove to the Indiana Supreme Court to work on 2/22/2001.

FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Straw v. United States, 21-1597 (Fed. Cir. 10/13/2021)
Straw v. United States, 21-1598 (Fed. Cir. 10/13/2021)

- *Held*: Court of Federal Claims cannot review another court's decisions to compensate for property takings that happen during those cases. Tucker Act cannot compensate for takings caused by other courts because other courts' actions may not be reviewed.

- Court made findings that I made frivolous filings when this is not so. Asking for judgments is not frivolous, even if I don't prevail. I had injuries and legal theory to match them in each and every case I have ever filed. There is no such thing as frivolous under those conditions. Simply being wrong about a delicate legal issue is not unethical, and calling a case or filing frivolous implies the case was unethical in being filed. **Courts abuse this term** by using it against those who are disfavored rather than those who truly abuse the courts with **nonsense facts** and **nonsense law**. I have never brought a case like that. I ask for judgments with good facts and good law.

U.S. COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

Straw v. United States, Case No. 17-1082C, 2017 WL 6045984, at *1 (Fed. Cl. Dec. 6, 2017)

- *Held*: Court of Federal Claims may not review any other court's actions to provide 5th Amendment Property Takings compensation even if such takings happened. Tucker Act not allowed to compensate takings caused by other courts.

Straw v. United States, No. 20-1145, ECF No. 18, (Fed. Cl. Jan. 12, 2021)

- *Held*: Court of Federal Claims may not review any other court's actions to provide 5th Amendment Property Takings compensation even if such takings happened. Tucker Act not allowed to compensate takings caused by other courts.

INDIANA TRIAL COURT

Straw v. Indiana, 53C06-2110-PL-2081 (Monroe Cty. Cir. Ct. #6)

- *Held* (4/4/2022): Law licenses are **royal privileges** and not subject to takings law at all.

- *Held* (4/4/2023): Even after the Court of Appeals **rejected** the notion that law licenses are not property protected by the Indiana Bill of Rights and the 5th Amendment through the 14th Amendment, a lawyer cannot amend to meet the pleading requirements laid out in a **first impression Court of Appeals decision**. Implicitly suggesting again that law licenses are not protectable property for takings because the Indiana Supreme Court would have to be reviewed, even though this was never asked, only compensation if a taking were found. *Res judicata* was wrongly used to disallow an amendment to match the Court of Appeals' reasoning.

- My expert for purposes of summary judgment stated without contradiction that I did not violate any ethical rule and the suspension was wrong and that my federal judges were also wrong on these disability rights issues. My expert was ignored, as was the

other state that refused to impose the suspension because it was "a drive-by shooting" of sanctions, not merited at all under Rule 3.1.

- It is not unusual for reactionary judges to oppose civil rights change and use their powers to do so, even against a civil rights giant.

INDIANA COURT OF APPEALS

Straw v. Indiana, 22A-PL-766 (Ind. Ct. App. 2022)

- *Held*: law licenses are property protected by the Bill of Rights (¶9) and the Takings Clause, but a lawyer must allege a **conscription of time** or that a **taking was done for a public use**. Affirmed by suggesting these grounds were not sufficiently pleaded. (¶¶ 10-12)
- *IFP* was granted in the trial court, so the appeal was also allowed *IFP*.

Straw v. Indiana, 22A-PL-2352 (Ind. Ct. App. 2022)

- *Held*: *IFP* will not be granted to determine if an amendment can be made to address the **first impression earlier decision** and make the complaint match those requirements, **not earlier apparent**.

- Two Indiana appellate decisions in 2022 held that a dismissal based on **Ind. Tr. R. 12(B)(6) alone** is ***without prejudice*** and an **amendment must be allowed**. *Bland's* & *Payne-Elliot*. This was not imposed here. That rule was absolutely abandoned by not allowing me to enforce it by avoiding the decision using *IFP* to block it when I am unable to pay filing fees precisely because the Indiana courts have driven me into poverty.

Straw v. Indiana, 23A-PL-775 (Ind. Ct. App. 8/15/2023)

- *Held*: **Law licenses are not protected property** (an absolute 180-degrees about face from 2022) because a Takings case at a lower court necessarily would have to review the suspension order and a trial court or the Court of Appeals may not do that when the Supreme Court is granted total power to sanction attorneys under Article 7, Section 4, of the Indiana Constitution. According to the

Court of Appeals, this represents **relitigating the suspension** even when **I did not ask for the suspension to be overturned**. I asked instead for the taking of my licenses without due process, without considering mitigating facts, and with the bias of the Chief Justice on full display against those who have mental illness, like I do from Camp LeJeune poisoning, to result in property rights and takings compensation. My property has been taken and no reasonable person can agree with how this happened when I am a crime victim and my disabilities so scorned are from that source.

- *I am a **9/11 toxic exposure victim**.*

- *A **reckless driver** broke both my legs and pelvis and the skull in my face as I drove to this very same Indiana Supreme Court to work.* Indiana Supreme Court and lower courts refused me Workers Compensation even when I drove to every county in the state as part of my Indiana Supreme Court job.

- *I am a **Camp LeJeune victim**, poisoned where I was born.* My mother was killed by this while I was in Law School in Bloomington.

INDIANA SUPREME COURT

In re Andrew U. D. Straw, 98S00-1601-DI-12 (Ind. 2/14/2017)
In re Straw, 68 N.E.3d 1070 (Ind. 2/14/2017)

- *Held*: Rule 3.1 "frivolous" case prohibition was used to impose 180 days of suspension for my federal ADA cases where no federal court sanctioned me and thus reciprocal suspension was not possible. Indiana Supreme Court, my former employer, has imposed this suspension as a retaliation against my own ADA complaints, using **its own ADA coordinator** to do so. Then, the 180 days was expanded to 6.5 years because my legal career collapsed to ZERO and my income with it. I did not have the $500 to pay for reinstatement review with so much vitriol both in the ORDER and repeated across the country.

- *Held*: When 3 federal judges (not 4) used the term frivolous at some point in their proceedings, this could be used to take a disabled man's law career away, wrecking and ruining 6 law licenses in total, Virginia's not because of any sanction but because of the poverty Indiana imposed, with help from many other hotheaded federal and state judges. However, the final orders in these 4 cases do not all say frivolous. Only one did.

- Federal courts have held since the beginning that state courts cannot interfere with federal courts, ***at all***. While this is agreed across the entire country with hundreds of reaffirmations of this, Indiana blatantly violates this rule to injure me and **no one helps me to stop it**. *Crosley Corporation v. Hazeltine Corporation*, 122 F.2d 925, **929** (3d Cir. 1941)

- The U.S. Supreme Court would not grant me certiorari to unravel this unjust and unfair taking of my law license affecting and ruining 5 other law licenses on top. *Straw v. Indiana Supreme Court*, 16-1346 (6/26/2017). This is a perfect example of why the certiorari system is unconstitutional. *Straw v. United States*, 23-16039 (9th Cir.)

VIRGINIA STATE BAR

In the Matter of Andrew U. D. Straw, 17-000-108746 (Virginia State Bar Panel, 6/20/2017)

- *Held*: Using an ADA coordinator of the Indiana Supreme Court to impose such a harsh suspension based on no suspension in 4 federal courts that did not sanction me (*dicta* criticisms only), **"had all the grace and charm of a drive-by shooting."**

- *Held*: 5-judge VSB panel said I proved to a level of **clear and convincing evidence** that **I did not violate Rule 3.1** and would not be subject to any sanction in Virginia for the exact same conduct that Indiana was going overboard about.

- Virginia State Bar's decision, made before the denial of certiorari, was **Last in Time** final and should be the *res judicata* that everyone follows. But nobody does. *Robi v. Five Platters, Inc.*, 838 F. 2d 318, **328** (9th Cir. 1988) (there are at least 421 citations to this case)

- See also: Ginsburg*, Judgments in Search of Full Faith and Credit: The Last-in-Time Rule for Conflicting Judgments*, 82 Harv. L. Rev. 798, **823** (1969)

- Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 15 (1982) explains the rule in this quote as follows:

> As Judge Sneed stated, the most recent decision **"is not binding because it is correct; it is binding because it is last."** *Id*. This concept of finality is central to the entire body of res judicata doctrine. See 18 Wright § 4403, at 15. (emphasis added)

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF N.C.

Straw v. United States, 7:23-cv-162-BO-BM (E.D.N.C.)

- My Count II (Dkt. 25) of this Camp LeJeune Justice Act lawsuit under the new PACT Act is for compensation for this law license mess caused by Indiana and ***its drive-by shooting***. I seek 10x the property takings in pain and suffering because I have suffered poverty and abuse by other courts that simply want Indiana's attack on me to succeed based on my Camp LeJeune mental illness. Indiana bans all disabled people from being lawyers and that reinforces why Indiana attacked me. All harms from having a mental illness from Camp LeJeune must be compensated now under this new law. Indiana hurt me. Congress said pay. The United States must pay, but I have no objection to the DOJ going after Indiana to reimburse the federal government for these injuries by a state based on a Camp LeJeune mental illness.

- All my motions, fully briefed, were ***denied without prejudice*** in a general order, wasting my time and the government's.

- I listed discrimination in my Dkt. 55 short form complaint.

- I asked for injunction relief (Dkt. 56) for health payments, cancer screening, medical care, HHA, service dog needs, and an educational benefit in the form of a **temporary loan** to be repaid from my damages later, but **Judge Boyle said no**.

  I asked declaratory judgment (Dkt. 57-4) that Virginia's exoneration of me be considered *res judicata*, **last in time**. **Judge Boyle said no. Dkt. 65**

  I asked for my exposure and injury facts, 100% well documented, to be declared as a matter of law (Dkt. 58). **Judge Boyle said no. Dkt. 65.**

Straw v. United States, 23-2156 (4th Cir.)

- Judge Terrence Boyle refused three different motions (**Dkt.** 56 / 56-2, **Dkt.** 57-4 / 57-2, and **Dkt.** 58) for individual relief that were fully explained and documented and justified.

  The denial ORDER for **Dkt.** 56 was **Dkt.** 59. It was one page long and provided **NO factual findings** and **NO legal reasons** for his ORDER, only noting that he had read the motion before denying it.

  The denial ORDER for **Dkts.** 57-4 and 58 was not even a separate document, but simply a text ORDER at **Dkt. 65**, again with **NO factual findings** and **NO legal reasoning**.

  If a simple NO was the only requirement, a judge could ignore evidence and facts in ANY CASE and say NO just because he wants to say no without rational reason at all. **That shows bias.**

  The 4th Circuit must reverse him on all 3. Judge Boyle has a history of defending court mental illness disability discrimination. *Jacobs v. N.C. Admin. Office of the Courts*, 780 F.3d 562, 31 A.D. Cas. 546 (4th Cir. 2015). Boyle has the same bad attitude as the Indiana Supreme Court, which ruined my law career because of my Camp LeJeune mental illness, pure and simple discrimination. **Dkts.** 25 & 55.

  See, *LinkedIn* case, Dkts. 22-1 to 22-58.

- I asked the 4th Circuit to take notice of how the **Dkt.** 59 denial injured my service animal and my food budget.

- I asked the 4th Circuit to take notice of the **Dkt. 65** errors denying my motions at **Dkts.** 57-4 and 58 and the threat of decades of delay.

- Noting revelations of hiding studies, I asked FULL JUSTICE.